

Many people are planning to comment at one of the seven [scoping hearings](#) scheduled by the Department of Energy (DOE) from March 14-20. The Forest Society will be commenting as well, likely on Monday March 14 in Pembroke. If you share [our view](#) that the current Northern Pass proposal that has been submitted to the DOE is not in New Hampshire's interests, we encourage you to comment as well.

The purpose of these meetings is for the DOE to solicit public input about what should be taken into consideration in the [Environmental Impact Statement](#) (EIS). In this case, the EIS "*will evaluate the full range of potential environmental, social, cultural, and economic impacts in the U.S. from the construction and operation of the proposed new electric transmission line facilities.*" The EIS is meant to help the DOE decide whether or not to issue the required Presidential permit for the proposed Northern Pass project. The EIS will also "*examine potential impacts and compare the proposed actions against a set of reasonable alternatives.*"

So, what kinds of feedback might you offer as a landowner or an individual who feels strongly about the Northern Pass proposal?

1. Urge the DOE to include in the EIS a rigorous analysis of the impacts—ecological, economic, and social—of all other reasonable options. One option might be to use existing high voltage power line corridors, rather than cutting new Right-Of-Way. Another might be to bury the power line under existing transportation corridors, like an interstate highway or a railway line.
2. Urge the DOE to consider the economic impacts of choosing the “no action” alternative: How would *not* building Northern Pass impact the energy market? Might there be greater public benefits—ecological, economic and/or social—to not building Northern Pass?
3. No informed decision on Northern Pass can be made without considering ALL economic impacts of the project—positive, negative and neutral—for every alternative. The EIS needs to consider ALL the economic impacts, not just those studied by the applicant, like short-term jobs and property tax payments. The public needs to understand the full, long-term impact of each alternative on property values and related tax revenues, on real estate and banking markets, on local and regional tourism economies, the forest products industry, and the local energy industry.
4. The height of the towers for the project as proposed is taller than most trees, thus the visual impact will permanently alter the view for the entire 180-mile length. The EIS should use the latest technology to provide the public with the best visual impact imagery for the entire length of every alternative studied.
5. There are many public and private lands along the corridor that are permanently conserved. Not only do these conserved lands keep our scenic landscapes scenic, but they are meant to be protected from the very kind of commercial development

Northern Pass is proposing. We cannot easily recover this visual legacy once it is lost, nor the damage to historical and cultural resources, after their intrinsic values are compromised.